

Mr. OLD MIXON's
R E P L Y

TO THE LATE

Bishop *A T T E R B U R Y*'s
V I N D I C A T I O N

OF

Bishop *S M A L L R I D G E*, Dr. *A L D R I C H*, and *H I M S E L F*,

FROM

Some *P A S S A G E S* in the *P R E F A C E* to the *H I S T O R Y* of
the *R E I G N S* of the *S T U A R T S*.

R E L A T I N G T O

Mr. *E D M U N D S M I T H* of *O x f o r d*'s Discovery of *I N D I R E C T P R A C T I C E S*
in the Publication of the *H I S T O R Y* of the *G r a n d R e b e l l i o n*.



L O N D O N:

Printed for J. PEMBERTON, in *Fleet-street*; T. COX, at the *Royal Exchange*;
R. FORD, and R. HETT, both in the *Poultry*; and sold by J. ROBERTS, in
Warwick-Lane. M.DCC.XXXII.

(Price One Shilling.)

MR. O L D M I X O N , S

Y J P E R

TO THE STATE

Billings N T F R B U R Y. s

VINDICATION

90

Bishop SMALLERIDGE, Dr. ALDRICH, and HINSELEY.

4043

the Regions of the SUBURBS

REFLECTING

in the publication of the HISTORY of the GREAT BRITAIN.

Y D Q X O J

W. J. Jones, and R. Jones, both in the Navy, and told by the informant as
 friends of J. Thompson, in New York; Thompson, the informant said,
 was in the Navy, and told by the informant as

(Price One Shilling)

A REPLY to the late Bishop Atterbury's Vindication, &c.

NO body can reasonably think the Consideration of the late Bishop Atterbury's Vindication was deferred two or three Months, in Expectation of his Death, which has happen'd in the interim, there being no Talk of his drawing so near his End, and his Letter being written soon after his Return from *Montpellier* in *South France*; where he had liv'd a good while for his Health, which was so well recover'd, that he seem'd to have promis'd himself the Life of an *Antediluvian*: For he says, *There is no Vanity in hoping that, old as I am, I shall out-live the Belief* of those undue Practices with Lord Clarendon's History, which Mr. *Edmund Smith* spoke of; a Period of Time to which hardly any Limits can be put, but the End of Time itself. Besides, the Contents of the Letter might have been refuted in as many Days as it was Years in writing, had not my great Distance from *London*, and a tedious Fit of the Gout, oblig'd me to postpone considering it till now; when my Health is not so well settled, as to tempt me to say, I take Pen in Hand with pleasure. If I should give myself the Liberty with him, that has been taken with me in the Title-Page to his Letter, I should deserve Censure, were he living: and much more now he is dead. But I verily believe, the Words *Scandalous Reflections* of *Oldmixon*, in that Title-Page, were not his own; but the Effect of that Moderation and Candour, for which our bigotted *Academicks* are eminent above those of any other Societies of Learning in the World. If the Reflections are true, they cannot justly be termed scandalous; and the Truth of the Reflections depending on the Truth of the Facts, these are first to be consider'd.

And herein I very frankly confess, that, upon a strict Enquiry, I have reason to believe, that Mr. *Edmund Smith*, of *Christ-Church, Oxford*, who made the Discovery of the Alterations in Lord Clarendon's History, did not sufficiently distinguish the Part Bishop Atterbury had in those Alterations, from that the Deans *Smallridge*, and especially *Aldrich* had. For, when that History was to be prepar'd for the Press, and it was thought proper to revise and retouch it, Bishop Atterbury was very desirous to have a Share in that Work; but the Managers had so ill an Opinion of his Discretion and Temper, that they would not entrust him with it: which he highly resent'd; and stuck not to say to some of his Friends, *they would spoil it*; probably because he was not one of them. And after the first Volume was publish'd, and he saw what had been done, he cry'd, *They have play'd the fool, and alter'd it*; or Words to that effect. For I do not pretend to be infallible in the Terms, my Information coming from Memory, almost thirty Years after the things were said and done: But this comes from a Person of that Honour and Distinction, in the learned World, that I cannot doubt of the Truth of it in Substance, if not in Form. And here I must observe, what great Difficulties I have to struggle with in the Disquisition of this Matter: For, tho' I have daily very credible Notices, to confirm what I have said, and may say, of the Razures and Interpolations in Lord Clarendon's Manuscript; yet every one is shy of appearing as an Evidence, in fear of the Resentment of a Set of Men, that never forgive; and have too many Opportunities of blackening, abusing, and injuring those that offend them.

To return to the late Bishop Atterbury. If he had never seen the MS. Copy of the *History of the Rebellion*, how cou'd he know it was alter'd, and for the worse too? Tho' they wou'd not trust him as a Manager, they could not well deny him a Sight of the Copy; which a vast Number of principal Persons of the Party did see: and King William's Queen Mary had also that Curiosity, and saw it before it had pass thro' other Hands: And if another Prince was not to be so favour'd, one cannot help thinking, 'twas because it was not exactly in the same Form, as when Queen Mary read it, or Part of it. Upon the whole, had we no other Ground to go upon than

than the great Intimacy and Friendship between Dr. *Aldrich*, Dr. *Smallridge*, and Dr. *Atterbury*, could one doubt whether the two former had excluded the latter from so much as a View of the MS. History? Or if they had been so tenacious of the Secret, that Dr. *Sprat*, his Predecessor in the See of *Rockester*, who let so many, even some of the Boys of *Westminster-School*, see it, or an authentick Transcript of it; by the same Token, some of them transcrib'd it again, by Command of their Master, for the Use of the Press, as the Lads understood it: Would Bishop *Sprat*, I say, have refus'd a Sight of it to Bishop *Atterbury*, or so curious a Man as Himself was, not have desir'd it, when the History was about to be publish'd? This is not within Credibility. Yet does the late Bishop aver, *he never saw my Lord Clarendon's History in Manuscript, either before, or since the Edition of it; nor ever read a Line of it but in Print.* I beg, that this may be seriously weigh'd by the Impartial; together with the Circumstances of the Bishop's Confidence with every Person concern'd in the publishing of the *History of the Rebellion*; the Opinion they All had of his Zeal and Abilities, and the late Bishop's known Curiosity in every thing that related to the Church and Literature.

The Friendship and Intimacy between him and the two Deans before-mention'd, might occasion Mr. *Edmund Smith's* throwing them all together in a cursory Expression in Conversation; and the Gentleman, who wrote the Letter to me, and had it from Mr. *Smith's* own Mouth, is not accountable for every Particular in the Fact, but for his so expressing himself to him: which he still insists upon. And the Fact in general being true, as it is related of Mr. *Hampden's* Character, the Strength of it is not weaken'd by a Mistake in a Circumstance. Here again I must come to new Information, which I receiv'd at second hand from a Person of equal Dignity in Character with Dr. *Atterbury*; even when he was Bishop of *Rockester*. That which is said of Mr. *Hampden*, in Allusion to the Character of *Cinna*, is in the Margin of the Original, or some Transcript, from which the History was printed, written in different Ink from the genuine Text; in which there is a Rasure of four or five Lines, to make room for it.

Such are the Notices that are constantly given me; many of which I reject as traditional, if not fabulous; having in all this Affair nothing in view but the Discovery of Fact, which I suspected long ago from the Face and Texture of the History itself; it being impossible to be true in the most exceptionable Parts of it, as I have prov'd at large in the Prefaces and Introductions to the *Critical Histories*, and *Clarendon* and *Whitlocke* compar'd. And if the Gentlemen at *Oxford* would bestow a tenth Part of the Pains they have taken, and are taking, to vindicate their MS. in vindicating their History, against the Objections in those Treatises, the World would be more oblig'd to them, and they would do more Honour to the Memory of their Historian; which, I think, I have had greater Regard to than themselves, by clearing it of what they cannot clear it in the History, and laying it on the *Editors*.

This I despair of seeing. They have let that Matter sleep these seven or eight Years; and I am sanguine enough to believe they will never awaken it, for that they are jealous of the Consequences. I would not have so mean a Thought, that they are more concern'd for the Credit of their Copy, than for that of their Patron, on account of the former's having been very beneficial to them; and that there is great Reason to be apprehensive of its suffering in the lucrative Part of it, if the least Blemish of undue Practice be left upon it. But it is to be suspected, they have the Market very much at heart, because they were very indolent and careless in the Business, till the late deadness of the Sale provok'd them to endeavour to quicken it, by the Bishop's notable Vindication, and some other Attempts; of which, whatever Hopes they have conceived, I am entirely satisfy'd, they will not deceive mine.

When I first objected to the Genuineness of many Passages in Lord *Clarendon's* History, Dr. *Smallridge*, one of the suppos'd Correctors, mention'd by Mr. *Edmund Smith*, was living. I hinted my Suspicion nine Years ago, that there had been Management in the Publication of the History of the *Grand Rebellion*; and that even the Members of his Society of *Christchurch* were concern'd in it. So long since as the Year 1723, I wrote thus; *We will now enquire a little into this pretended Rebellion, a Term Brady and his Followers are extremely fond of. I know not, if the Earl of Clarendon did call his History that of the Rebellion himself; or whether it was so entituled by the Christchurch Men; there being more in it of the Spirit and Manners of Collegiates, than of a Man of Quality.* This Suspicion of mine is lately confirm'd by other Informations, that really his Lordship's History was by himself entituled, *The History of the Civil War*, and not of the *Grand Rebel-*

Rebellion, which the Earl could not call it, without contradicting himself in Sentiment and Principle, as there is frequent Contradiction in Fact in that History: See *Clarendon and Whitlock compar'd*, p. 106, 107. where the thing appears in full Light. And whereas Bishop *Atterbury* suggests I waited till all the Parties concern'd but himself were dead, to publish my Doubts of the Genuineness of the whole History, that Suggestion of his was made by myself, and answer'd several Years since in the Preface to *Clarendon and Whitlock*, p. xix. to which I refer, to avoid long Repetitions.

Bishop *Atterbury* adds, *Were those worthy Persons, Aldrich and Smallridge alive, they would be equally able and ready to clear themselves from so foul an Aspersions*; and seven or eight Lines after, he confesses the *Care of revising the Manuscript was committed* to that very Dr. *Aldrich*: and what must be the necessary Consequence of revising, but *correcting* and *altering*, at least in some Places, a Copy which was so very ill written, that it was not easily legible, as all agree, excepting one very Reverend Person, who, on account of his Order, shall be nameless, and who declar'd upon the Publication of my History of *England*, that he saw the original Manuscript as it went to the Press, and there was not a Word, nay I think it was, not a Letter alter'd in it? Which cannot be true; for the Spellings were very bad, as I have heard, and as I verily believe, having before me a short Letter of Sir *Edward Hyde's* own Hand-writing, wherein are several false Spellings, as *Sunn* for *Son*, *Frende* for *Friend*, *Myne* for *Mine*, &c. and surely they would have been alter'd, had they pass'd under Correction. Bishop *Atterbury* owns the Manuscript was not *very correctly written*, and I leave it to any one to judge, whether when the Correctors were mending Letters and Words, they might not be sometimes tempted to mend, as they thought, the Sense; which is deny'd with so much Obstinacy and Assurance, that of itself it renders the thing suspected. 'Tis true, upon the first Intention to publish this History, I am told the Proprietors were very scrupulous of having Alterations made; and when it was propos'd to alter some Words, which being fresh *Gallicisms*, had too much the Mark of Novcity, however they came there, it was oppos'd, for that the Text was to be kept whole and unalterable; and accordingly those Marks of Novcity remain still, as Beauties and Flowers of Rhetorick, tho' extremely affected and faulty in historical Narration; which the Gentlemen, my Opponents, do not seem to understand very well, tho' one would think they should not be now to learn it.

I complain'd of those *Gallicisms* in my *Remarks on the History of the Rebellion*, printed in 1727. before I had any Information of Fact: See the Preface. It is P. 66 suspected that the Lord *Clarendon's* History was very much alter'd by the Editors at Oxford, that the original Manuscript is interpolated and raz'd in several Places, on which I lay no Stress, though I believe I have good Reasons to suspect it; the *Gallicisms* *Eclaircissement*, *Eclat*, to give into a Thing, &c. are modern, and were hardly in use in France at that Time, in the Sense the Historian uses them. To this the Gentlemen have nothing to say, nor to what follows; and till they can and do answer it, all their Labour about the Legitimacy of their Offspring, will signify nothing in Proof of its Honesty and Integrity.

That the Images, or Characters, were for the most part produc'd by Fancy, appears by the Difference of Likeness in his Lordship's and other Histories, by the Abundance of them, and by the Perfection, which is all on one Side; it being impossible in Nature to pick out so many wise, virtuous and valiant Men list'd in the Cause of Persecution and Oppression, and so many Blockheads and Poltrons in that of Religion and Liberty; the Thing speaks itself, yet so it is all along in the History of the Rebellion.

I call upon them to answer this, and a Thousand other such Objections in *Clarendon and Whitlock compar'd*; Proofs all, that the History is not true: See the Index to that Treatise, *Artic. Clarendon Lord*; where they are enumerated, and need not be repeated here. I said long enough before this Matter came into Contest, that I laid no Stress on the Suspicion of Interpolations and Razures; I prov'd by comparing the History with *Whitlock*, whom Archdeacon *Echard* owns to be a fair Writer, that the History of the *Rebellion* is an unfair one. I have brought a Cloud of Witnesses out of *Whitlock*, *Rushworth*, &c. to prove it; and truly, all the Oxford Gentlemen can, or do say to the contrary, is, that whether Right or Wrong, the Lord *Clarendon* wrote it, and that no body else is to be charg'd with whatever Flattery or Deformity there are in his Painting.

I was willing enough, for the Honour of the Noble Historian, to hear what several Gentlemen, unknown to each other, and without the least Concert, told me of

the Management the Manuscript had met with; and how, to use Bishop *Atterbury's* Words, the Editors had play'd *the fool with it*. But for my own part, I was not much concern'd about it, nor matter'd, who they were that wrote or edited the History and Characters: my Concern was to shew, that neither the one nor the other were true, unless *Rushworth* and *Whitlock* were false. I did shew it, and all the Proprietors of the Copy say in defence of their History, is, that it was the Lord *Clarendon's*; tho' it is notorious that some of the Characters could not be Lord *Clarendon's*, without such Contradiction and Inconsistency, as I am loth to suppose that honourable Author could be guilty of. This relates in an especial manner to Mr. *Hampden's* Character, which I happen'd to hit upon twelve or thirteen Years after Mr. *Edmund Smith's* Death, without having heard a Syllable of the Practice that had been made upon it: It was so contradictory to every thing the Historian had said of Mr. *Hampden* in the Body of his History, that it seem'd monstrous to close it with so gross and shocking an Expression, *He had a Head to contrive, a Tongue to persuade and a Hand to execute any* Mischief. I was sensible that all was not right here as soon as I read it. 'Tis a downright Unsaying, and that in a very cruel and barbarous Manner, all that he had said before in praise of Mr. *Hampden*, of whom he writes every where, as a Gentleman lately observ'd, *this single Passage only excepted, with the utmost Temper, Candour and Decency*: and to sink all at once from that Equality of Temper, to the very Dregs of Passion and Slander, is not credible in so exalted a Genius. See the *Preface to Clar. and Whit.* *There is no Character, not the most amiable, but it has some Blemish, as Mr. Hampden's in particular; a Gentleman of so great Parts and Merit, that his very Enemies, who were not his Enemies, but as he was a Lover of his Country, were forc'd to speak of him always with Honour; he was the most respected and belov'd of any Man then living, yet the Earl of Clarendon says of him, or the Editors say it for him, he had a Hand and a Heart fit for any thing, either good or bad, to promote Virtue or commit Sacrilege.*

Free Bril.
No 106.

Bishop *Atterbury* asserts, *Let the Expression be never so severe, it may naturally be suppos'd to have come from the Pen of an Historian, who had himself with Zeal oppos'd Mr. Hampden's Measures.* God forbid this should be true, tho' the late Bishop taught it. What a Notion had he of the Nature of History, who thought *Falsbood* and *Slander* natural to it? and what of the Earl's Judgment, Integrity and Honour, who could be so much warm'd by his Resentment, as to forget what was due to Decency and Truth; and to do a needless Injury, as the late Bishop himself styles it, to the honourable Memory of so worthy and so great a Patriot? But it is very natural to conceive, that the Editors, at a Time when their *Party* were in fear of losing the Hold they had of the late Queen, might put no Restraint on their Thoughts or Expressions, to blacken Persons and Things according to their Passions and Prospects.

I come now to the most difficult Part of the late Bishop's *Vindication*; for it compels me to prove the Weakness of it, by touching Characters, which are become in a manner sacred by the Death of the Persons: the Task is invidious, and as odious to myself, as it can be to the most delicate of my Readers. *De Martuis nil nisi bonum*, is in every one's mouth; but when my own Character is so nearly concern'd in the Justification of what I have said, I am excusable to use all lawful Means of defending it, and all Means are lawful that are true: Let the late Bishop's Title-Page be remember'd, the *Scandalous Reflections* of *Oldmixon*; and then let it be consider'd whether the Provocation is not equal to the Offence.

Bishop *Atterbury's* Words are, *They, Bishop Sprat, Dean Aldrich, and the late Earl of R——, were Men of Probity and Truth, and incapable of conspiring in a Design to impose on the Publick.* I am willing, if every one would agree to it, that the Dispute should be reduc'd to this Issue, and that it may be decided by the general Notion People have of the Disposition and Capability of those Gentlemen to conspire in such a Work, as the Edition of the Lord *Clarendon's* History, how they might best serve the Cause they espous'd, and make such an Impression on the Mind of the late Queen, as might prevent her from employing Persons of Charitable and Revolutionary Principles: for it is to be observ'd, that the History of the *Rebellion* was publish'd just about the Time that her late Majesty Queen *Anne* was about changing Hands, and taking into her Service those good and great Men, who were most zealous for reducing the exorbitant Power of *France*, and securing the Protestant Succession. 'Twas at that nice Juncture, that the *Grand Rebellion* made its first glorious Appearance from the Press, in an Expectation that it would knock down all Opposition, and confirm the Queen in a High-Church Administration. On this Foundation were the Fabricks of the *Preface* and *Dedication* to the History rais'd; and on the same

same Foundation doubtless those stately Edifices, the Characters, in whole or in part.

That the *Prefacer*, see who he was in Bishop *Atterbury's* Vindication, might be p. 6. as well in the Secret of the Alteration of the History, as in that of the *High-Church Memorial*, publish'd about the same time, one cannot well doubt; and that he was in that Secret, I believe is doubted by nobody; notwithstanding that the Memorial was voted to be *seditions and scandalous* by the Legislature, and their Sense of it, confirmed by her late Majesty herself.

The celebrated Mr. *Maynwaring* was of Opinion, that this *Prefacer* was a Party in that *Memorial*, of which he says, in his *Ten Champions*, "To say no worse of it at present, I will venture to affirm, that, unless in some Legend of Knight-Errantry, so many idle *Inventions*, *Dreams*, and direct Falshoods were never yet published to the World." He then musters these *Ten Champions* for *High-Church*: The D. of B——; the E——ls of R——, N——, &c. I had rather think the late Bishop *Atterbury* had never read the Votes, *Temp. Car. II.* to remove the same Person from all Offices of Profit and Trust, than that he would in defiance of them, enter so far into Panegyrick; and to do it, sink also the Incident of the *High Commission-Court*, so very inconsistent with the Safety of the Church of *England*, whose Danger provok'd all the Scandal and Sedition in the *High-Church Memorial*: yet both the Earl and Bishop of R—— sate in that very Court, and the E——l in particular, in Judgment on the Bishop of London; which Court has been declar'd by the Legislature to be illegal, and destructive of our Constitution, Ecclesiastical and Civil. The Gentlemen who have undertaken the late Bishop *Atterbury's* Defence, are desir'd to reconcile this with *Probity* and *Truth*; nor must we forget the Oaths of Fidelity to King *William*, which the former of these two *Editors* took, nor the great Employment of the Lieutenancy of *Ireland*, under that Prince of glorious Memory, nor other great Employments under Queen *Anne*, at the same time that in Conscience he was in another Interest, as appears by what was said of him in a Book suppos'd to be written by *Daniel Foe*, by Direction, or Encouragement of the *Quondam* Treasurer *Har—y*, who could not but be well acquainted with the Subject thus describ'd; p. 76. He was rigidly strict Mofnager's Min. in his Opinion, as to the Legality of the British Settlement, and openly profess'd that the Revolution had made such a Breach in the Constitution, as would justify Revolutions of every kind, how often soever they might happen; and that it was impossible, according to the Revolution-Doctrine, as it was then call'd, that there could ever be any Rebellion in Great Britain. The Queen could never engage him to act heartily for her, notwithstanding the Oaths of Allegiance and Abjuration, because he esteem'd her Reign an Usurpation upon the House of Stuart, and he fail'd not to let her know it.

I am weary of this ungrateful kind of History, and avoid making any Remarks upon it, which probably the Reader will do, in calling to mind what Bishop *Atterbury* said of *Probity* and *Truth* before-mention'd; which, as it relates to Bishop *Spratt*, will be somewhat more surprizing to those that know who was the Author of the Romance of the *Ryehouse Plot*; which is thus well explain'd in a Weekly Paper, by a Gentleman, to whose Generosity I am oblig'd, it being written in my favour, tho' I was unknown to him, and he had nothing to excite him to it, but a Search after Truth.

What the Spirit of Bishop *Spratt* was, may I think be easily known by his History From Brit. Decemb. 93 of the *Ryehouse Plot*, a Forgery that cost the Lord *Russel*, Col. *Algernon Sidney*, and some of the best Men in the Kingdom their Lives; peradventure the notable Temper and Candour of that charitable and impartial Work, recommended this pious Prelate to the high Office of revising Lord *Clarendon's* History.

The *Ryehouse Plot* History was propos'd to Dr. *South*, not without a Promise of high Preferment if he would undertake it; which he refus'd to do, after he had seen what *Memoirs* King *Charles* the Second's Ministers had prepar'd for him to write upon: which were such, as it is said, the Doctor should say, he would not have hang'd a Dog upon the Evidence. This Bishop *Spratt*, this Man of Probity and Truth, did not only murder the Lord *Russel* in the treasonable Charge against him to justify his Death, but murder'd also his Memory, by charging him, with filling his Speech with enormous Falshoods. The most religious and virtuous Peer of his Time, is said by Bishop *Spratt* to die with a Lye in his Mouth; upon which, I find this Reflection by a late Historian; "Spratt's Character is so notorious, that I would not have blemish'd the meanest Offender upon his Authority; and if he did not heartily repent of so wicked a Calumny on this pious murder'd Peer and Patriot, the Lord have Mercy upon him."

The

The Illustrious Person whom Bishop Spratt charges with telling lyes with his last Words, is the same of whom their Majesties King *William* and Queen *Mary* spoke so honourably in the Preamble to his Father's Patent to be Duke of Bedford. *It was not the least Reason*, for creating him so, *that he was Father to the Lord Russel, the Ornament of his Age*, an enormous Lyar, says the late Bishop Spratt the Editor, *whose great Merits 'twas not enough to transmit by History to Posterity, but we are willing to record them in our Royal Patent, to remain in the Family as a Monument consecrated to his consummate Virtue, whose name can never be forgot so long as Men preserve any Esteem for Sanctity of Manners, Greatness of Mind, and a Love to their Country, constant even to death.* Can one doubt whether an Historian, who could charge such a Christian Hero with lying before God and Man in the last Moments of Life, would scruple to corrupt the Lord Clarendon's History with Misrepresentations and Scandal? He was not capable of doing such a thing, says Bishop Atterbury; but he was capable of doing so bad a one, that there is no word in our Language bad enough for it. Thus much for Bishop Spratt's Integrity. And as to his *Invention*, it must remain unquestioned, as long as that fine Panegyrick of his upon *Oliver Cromwell*, can be seen as a Proof of it. For it shews, that as he could blanch the foulest Character, so he could blacken the fairest.

He was not capable, says the late Bishop, of making the least Alteration in the Lord Clarendon's History, so remarkable was he for Probity and Truth. I repeat my Offer to throw the Merit of the Cause in question on this Point only, Whether the World thinks, or does not think that he who forged the *Romance* of the *Ryehouse-Plot*, was capable of forging any part or parcel of the Characters in the History of the *Rebellion*.

Bishop Atterbury adds, Bishop Spratt more than once assur'd him that no Additions whatsoever were made in the Manuscript. No Additions whatsoever is a very strong Expression, it excludes even a *the*, a *that*, or a *which*, a *Point*, or a *Comma*, and is incredible, taken as it was said; but taken, as they will say it was meant, I beg leave to transcribe the Answer in the *Free Briton*: *The Gentleman knows that the complaint of Alterations, hath often been brought, and always was very loud. If there never was any charge brought, and if there never was any suspicion of this kind, whence did that Conversation arise?* You must know, the Bishop objects against the Complaint, because it was made lately, *which*, he says, *happened more than once, Wherein Bishop Spratt and Dean Aldrich, who have been dead above these twenty years, gave him their Assurances, that the printed History was genuine: Had it never been questioned, how could it thus have been answered? or, What occasion could they have to give their Assurances, if their Integrity had never been doubted or suspected?* As to coming too late with the Complaint, the same Author judiciously takes notice, *The Charge of Imposture affected an Earl, and two Persons soon after made Bishops; had it been published while the Earl lived, or before Bishop Smallridge died, or while the late Bishop of Rochester continued a Lord of Parliament, even Truth itself might have been punished by Actions of Scandalum Magnatum, and therefore it was not safe.* But in truth, none of these Considerations should have hindred me from discovering the Fraud, had I been informed of it; and the Gentleman, who gave me the Information, thought not of it, till he read the Preface to *Clarendon* and *Whitlock* compared, where I made publick my Suspicion, grounded only on the Impossibility, or at least the Improbability, that the Earl of *Clarendon* should himself deviate in his Characters so much from his History; which, Mr. *Edmund Smith* said, is to such a degree, that if that Lord's History, and that of Dr. *Aldrich* and Company, were printed in opposite Columns, they would appear as different one from the other, as if they had been written by different hands. Whether this be so or not, 'tis certain he said it, and I have no opportunity to prove that what he said was false, or hyperbolical.

The late Bishop proceeds:

As to one of them, Dr. Smallridge, the late Bishop of Bristol, no suspicion of this kind can possibly rest on his Memory. Why so? Was he not of Parts equal to the Work? Was his Zeal for the Cause less fervent than that of the most Zealous? Was he not let into their deepest Secrets, even into that of *Sacheverel's* Speech before the House of Lords? Was he not often charged with being a Party in the Contrivance and Wording of that Speech, in company with the late Bishop Atterbury and Dr. *Moss*. This was suggested by Mr. *Maynwaring*, before mentioned, who had been Dr. *Smallridge's* Pupil at *Christ Church*, and to my own knowledge gave it as his opinion, that the Doctor was one of the Persons who made that Speech for *Sacheverel*,

of which he gives large Hints in his *second Letter to a Friend in North-Britain*, in what follows: But now comes the great scope of the Doctor's Performance; his own *Harangue at the Bar of the House of Lords*. And here, without entering into a particular examination of the whole piece, I cannot help professing with some sorrow, that I think he was too hardly used by THOSE WHO MADE IT FOR HIM, when they obliged him to aver in the face of God and the Queen, that he had neither suggested nor did in his Conscience believe, that the Church is in the least Peril from her Majesty's Administration. If THOSE MEN (had been endued with the least Mercy, Conscience or Humanity, THEY would never have put into his mouth such a shocking Provocation as this; and I cannot help taking his part against them upon this occasion, as abandoned a Priest as he is. Then the Author gives several Instances of the quite contrary in Sacheverel's own words. And what Reason could the late Bishop Atterbury have to affirm, It was not possible for any suspicion to rest on the memory of Bishop Smallridge? Pray mind, not possible, tho' a much harder suspicion lies upon it in the case of Sacheverel; and therefore such a thing is possible at least, whether the Fact be true or not, and the Probability is on the right side of the Question from the Doctor's Character and Capacity.

All the Argument and Proof the late Bishop gives you of the *Impossibility* of Dr. Smallridge's being suspected, is his bare saying, that the late Bishop Smallridge said, he was no ways concerned in preparing the History for the Press. The Author of the *Free Briton* above cited, has laid me any farther reflection on this head, by the following Paragraph: The late Bishop of Rochester affirms, that Dr. Smallridge, late Bishop of Bristol, was no ways concerned in preparing that History for the Press; and from this Assertion he infers, that no suspicion can possibly rest on his memory: which Assertion, like other Terms, seems contrived for the sake of the Conclusion. To make this more probable, he tells us, that his great Intimacy with Dr. Smallridge, both at Westminster and Christ-Church, gave him all the advantages requisite towards knowing the Truth of what he says; and therefore he tells us that he speaks with the more Assurance on this head. The plain English of which Argument is, that we must implicitly believe the bare Assertions of a Person who knows the Truth, and speaks with Great Assurance, how much soever it may be the Interest of him, and his whole Party, to falsify the Truth.

Again, I will add one general Observation on the nature of the like Assertions, That they are easy to be multiplied, even to an infinite number; and that this will almost always be the Practice, when a Person accused is under any necessity of clearing himself from the Charge, and when there are very few, if any at all, alive, able or willing to contradict such Assertions.

However, if we humour the two late Bishops Friends, and leave them out of the prime Management in this Affair, in return for their giving us two other Persons in their room, the late E. of R—— and Bishop Spratt, who are to supply their places: Can any one imagine that such a Scheme should be laid and prosecuted, and they know or hear nothing of it? as Bishop Atterbury pretends. It is too great a reflection on their Abilities and Principles to suppose it, especially considering there were other Doctors in the Confidence of this Management, if I am not misinformed, as in particular Dr. Delaune, Head of St. John's College, Oxon; who spoke of himself as one concerned in it, saying to a Friend, *We have left out the Riffraff, particularly the Canterbury Story of the Bull-Feast in Spain: For what was that to the Rebellion?* Here I am forbidden to name the Gentleman that communicated this to me. Had I been at liberty, I should have done it; and in such case, his Reputation for Honour and Merit would have gain'd belief universally. It was added, *The Story of the Bull-Feast was much more to the purpose than the Doctor seemed to think it: for it shewed the indiscreet Behaviour of Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham when in Spain, which made them ridiculous to the Spaniards.* And was not that a very good reason for the leaving it out? About the time that my History was published, I was told by a Right Honourable Person, that this Doctor Delaune did, not long before his death, declare that Alterations had been made in the History of the Rebellion, and that one Smith was employ'd in it. I look'd earnestly on that noble Person when he named Smith, expecting some farther *Eclaircissement* in the matter: but he added, The Doctor said, that Smith was on the Physick Line, and so he could not mean Edmund. Whether that may be a Mistake of the Doctor, or of the Gentleman I had it from, is not to be determined; and I put no more weight into the Scale for this Story, than the Conjecture of the Readers may give it. The Gentlemen who are continuing Bishop Atterbury's

Labours to clear the *Clarendon* History of the least Imputation of the least Addition, will be but grateful to the Memory of their Benefactor, if they leave the late *E* — *l* of *R* — out of the Question: in which they would do me a very singular Pleasure, because it goes against me to say any thing against him, who cannot speak for himself, and was of a Rank not to be spoken of, but with respect. Bishop *Atterbury* brings him too often on the Stage, unless he had done it with more Regard to his Character. He says, *The Earl in his Preface to the first Volume, for his I take it to be (tho' no Name is affixed to it) has publicly protested his Innocence in this Respect; where he declares, that they, who put forth the History, he means himself and his Brother, as appears by what follows, "durst not take upon them to make any Alterations in a Work of this kind; solemnly left with them" to publish, whenever it should be publish'd, as it was deliver'd to them.*

If this is not true in Fact what Truth can we expect in the Prosecution of this Contest? The MS. was so far from being *solemnly deliver'd to them*, to be printed without any Alterations, that they were allow'd, by the Earl of *Clarendon's* Will, to act as they thought fit; as may be seen by the very Words of the Will, which I had Recourse to, out of Suspicion, that there was no such *solemn Delivery in it*. 'Tis dated at *Rome* the 11th of *December* 1674.

Item, *I give and bequeath to my two Sons, my Executors, viz. Henry Viscount Cornbury, and Laurence Hyde Esq; all my Papers and Writings, of what kind soever, and leave them entire to their Disposal, by suppressing or Publishing, &c.* Not a Word of making no Alteration, or a *solemn Delivery*. The Papers are by the Will left to their Disposal, to be suppress'd, or publish'd, as they should think fit: Only they were enjoin'd to take the Advice of Dr. *Sheldon*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and Dr. *Morley*, Bishop of *Winchester*; whom he entreats to be *Overseers of his Will*. But they were dead twenty or thirty Years before it was thought *reasonable* to publish the History; and the Executors made choice of much better Counsellors in editing it, than were *Sheldon* and *Morley*.

Are not the Executors impower'd by this not only to suppress any Part of the History, as we suppose they have done, but the whole? And probably that would have been the Fate of it, if there had been a Necessity upon them to publish it exactly as it was written.

The next Argument the late Bishop *Atterbury* makes use of, for the Genuineness of the History of the *Grand Rebellion*, has the same Root as has mine, for its Falsification; and that is the Make and Manner of the History. And in this we may perceive how little the Gentlemen, who have undertaken to vindicate it, are appriz'd of the true Beauties and Defects of History: Which Deficiency of theirs, I take to be the Reason why the several Treatises I have publish'd, to shew its Faults and Infirmities, have been neglected by them: Tho', I doubt not, they put on *grand Airs*, and impute it to their Contempt of the Author. A Way of answering, which is easily imitated; especially when one has no other. *Could the Persons employ'd*, says the late Bishop, *be suppos'd to have made any Additions; notwithstanding such Assurances to the contrary; yet their good Sense (if not their Integrity) would have prevented at least their retouching those Characters, which are allowed to be the most distinguish'd and beautiful Part of the Work; and to have something of Original in them, that is not to be imitated.* This is allow'd, says he, but by whom? by the Party for whose Service those Characters were imagin'd. Does not every one, the least acquainted with the Rules for writing History, know, that, supposing the Facts upon which they are founded were true, the Redundancy and Repetition of them, render them extremely vicious in History. *Lucian* speaking of the historical Style, is the very Reverse of the Lord *Clarendon's* Manner. It should, according to *Lucian*, be *clear, intelligible, and natural*; and the Figures should not be too *sublime, or too far fetch'd: the Writer should fear all Enthusiasm, and excessive Strains, which are the greatest Faults of an Historian*. There is not in all History a Strain more excessive, than that in Injury of Mr. *Hampden*. *If he would rise, let it be rather by the things he represents, than Words.* "One might defy the whole College of Editors, it was said several Tears ago, if they were living, to give one Instance, where the Lord *Clarendon* rises by the Things; but hundreds might be produc'd, where he rises by the Words." *Lucian* again: *It is much better to relate extraordinary Things in a plain and common Manner, than to weaken the Thoughts, by straining the Imagination. I would have the Periods neither too long, nor too much studied.* See the first and second Periods in the History of the *Rebellion*, which would both take up near a Page, in a moderate *Octavo*. The Thoughts

Thoughts should have more Solidity than Lustre: They should come nearer the Reasons of a wise Statesman, than the polite Turns of a Declaimer. Which, if it had been said on purpose, could not have had more relation to the History of the Rebellion, as it is the easiest thing in the World farther to prove: but I have done it already at large in another Place; and have been bold to say, *There is not the least* ^{Prof. to} *Trace of Lucian's Method in his Lordship's History; and I am afraid the* ^{Clar. and} *Editors* ^{Whitl.} *knew too little of these Rules, to find any want of them.* Let me add a Hint or ^{comp.} two more on this Head, because it relates to the double Falsification, as well of the Facts, as the Manuscript. *The Style of the History of the Rebellion is the least historical of any that ever deserv'd the Name of History. The Periods are some twenty, some thirty Lines in length; so round, that we are lost in the Circle, as much as in a Magician's, and whenever we meet with such Declaiming in plain Story, we may be sure it is intended to amuse us, as Legerdemains make Flourishes, when they are about to play Tricks.*

This is what Bishop Atterbury calls the most beautiful and distinguish'd Part of the Work. And indeed when it came out first, the Beauty of the Colouring and Imagination had such an Effect on injudicious Readers, that they were not aware of the Mixture of Falshood with Truth; nor whether the Pictures were like or unlike. The Imagination warm'd; the Colouring glar'd; and the Injudicious could not but be charmed with the Brightness and the Novelty, enough for such to take them to be masterly and inimitable. By *historical Falshood* here, I do not intend *Fable*; be where the Facts are *curtail'd* or *enlarg'd*; where they are brought in or carried off with unfair and forc'd Reflections, then is the Work historically false: for that the whole Truth of the Facts does not appear; and of consequence the Reflections which are made upon them, must be ill grounded, and are not to be regarded.

It is very obvious, that the late Bishop of Rochester, by *inimitable*, when he spoke of the Characters in the Lord Clarendon's History, meant incomparable, super-excellent, and wonderful. And I do not in the least question, but the Gentlemen, who have engag'd in the Defence of it, do really take them to be so: tho', by that very means, it has not the least Resemblance of History, as Mr. Maynwaring said: I hope, it will not be thought a Digression, because it serves to set it in a true Light, if I repeat what a late Historian wrote on this Subject.

"I have often spoken of the Characters in the History of the Grand Rebellion; and as far as I could, have done Justice to their Merit. But I take the liberty to add here, that if every one of those Characters were still to be imagin'd, the History would be the same: And when they are detach'd so from the Subject, they are like vicious Episodes in an *Epick Poem*." Let me entreat the Gentlemen, who are taking pains to vindicate that Piece, and to edit others, to consider seriously what follows. "In History Mens Actions should mark the Characters; in Poetry, the Manners and Passions. I know very well, that a hundred to one of all the Readers of the *Grand Rebellion*, admire it most for those very Characters; and so they would the Episode of *Nicky Nacky*, in the Tragedy of *Venice Preserv'd*, and prefer it to the most moving Scene between *Jaffeir* and *Belvidera*. They care not, provided there is a Picture, whether 'tis like or not, if it glares; if, as in *French Painting*, there is Red and Yellow enough; 'tis with them admirable, *inimitable*. To excuse what I have said here, and elsewhere of this Profusion of Characters, I must produce some good Authority, and I cannot bring a more unquestionable one than the learned and polite Monsieur *Menage*, who is speaking of an *English* Historian of the XIIIth Century, *Matthew Paris*; whom he very much commends in most things, and blames only for such Stories as that of the Ghost in the *Clarendine Chronicle*; *Menagiana, Vol. II. p. 93.* In other respects, continues he, *Matthew Paris is sincere and frank, and without taking a great deal of Pains in drawing Characters, he gives you all the Ideas of them, that are necessary to be given. This, in my Opinion, is preferable to an Affectation of continually drawing Characters; of which too great a Number surfeits the Readers.* "It may be further said of Characters, that when they are arbitrary, and are not, as the *French* Criticks say, *born of the Subject*; when we meet with no Actions to give Birth to them, but they are made what the Maker has a mind to, as to Eulogy or Satyr, they are then most surfeiting; and no fine Painting can supply the Place of Likeness and Truth." Yet it is this very Defect, that Bishop Atterbury and his Fellow-Labourers term *inimitable*: and it is to be fear'd, they thought, and do think so.

It is necessary for me to have what Assistance I can against so many potent Adversaries; every Soul of them engag'd, as they think, in Interest and Honour to support the Credit of their History. I must own, very few have been so generous as to offer to assist me; and those that have done so, did it with Cautions and Restrictions, that render'd their Offer useless. *Don't concern yourself in the Matter*, has been said by some, who pretend much to be Friends to Liberty; who have lost nothing by their Pretences, and have even at other times declared their Desire to have the Fraud detected. I cannot help acquainting such, that I should have been as discreet, as they take themselves to be, if I had not had other Grounds to go upon, than what Information has laid in my Way; and than, I believe, they are sensible of.

The Author of the *Free Briton* deserves my Acknowledgments, above all others: For he has dar'd to speak his Mind, both of the late Bishop, and the *Grand Rebellion*, as in the following Paragraph.

It is said, that such Alterations could not be made in the Characters which Lord Clarendon left in his History, because they had something of Original in them, that is not to be imitated. Now the Manner of this noble Historian, suppose it ever so perfect, is at least as easy to be imitated, by a Man of great Parts and Imagination, as the Manner of Rubens was imitated by Vandyke; and yet we all know, that there are some Pictures done by the latter, which we should affirm to come from the Hand of the former, were not Facts undeniable. It is infinitely easy, even for a less Genius, to copy the Manner of a greater. Every Man, who hath been named, either by the late Bishop of Rochester, or by Mr. Oldmixon, as assisting to the Earl of Rochester in the Edition, were all of them Men of Fancy, and Men of Parts, rightly qualified to retouch any politick Paintings. Tho' I cannot perceive, that any great Genius, or very able Hand, was requisite in this Case, since any small Scribbler alive, when it was found necessary to blacken Mr. Hampden's excellent Name, might, with the least Stock of Learning, and much less Wit, have summ'd up his Life in the Character of the Roman Cinna. But that his Memory should be butcher'd in this manner by the Lord Clarendon, who speaks of him every where, this single Passage only excepted, with the utmost Temper, Candour, and Decency; this I am sure, is much more difficult to conceive, than that Pedants and Party Bigots should be guilty of foisting it in.

However, Bishop Atterbury is not contented with what he has said of those imitable Characters; he adds, *The After-Strokes of any less able Pencil intermixed with the first Masterly Hand, would soon be discovered.* Is Dr. Spratt Bishop of Rochester this less able Hand? He who had the most fruitful Invention and florid Expression of any Writer of his Time; he who drew King Charles the Second's Picture so admirably, in the *Declaration* which he put into his Mouth, after the Tragedy of the *Rye*; he who spoke for him better than any Monarch then, if not at any other Time living, could have spoken for himself, Which, false and wicked as it is, all *Connoisseurs* allow to be one of the best Pieces of Oratory in the *English* Tongue. In a word, he who in his before mentioned Panegyrick upon *Oliver Cromwel*, whom the Lord Clarendon has made a *Devil incarnate*, describes a Hero as much superior to all the Heroes in the History of the *Rebellion*, as the Duke of *Marlborough's* Character is superior to General *Monk's*.

Though Bishop Atterbury is got into a very miry Way, yet he jogs on still, and says, *I am persuaded the most discerning Eye can find out no Traces of Mixture; no, not in the Character of Mr. Hampden, even in those Words, at the close of it, against which Mr. Oldmixon declaims. They are perfectly in the Style and Manner of my Lord Clarendon. They contain nothing New in them, but only sum up in short, what he had scattered through different Parts of the two first Volumes.* If the late Bishop speaks Truth here, to what Purpose did the Author, I last cited, examine those different Parts? And how could he find them full of *Temper, Candour* and *Decency* with respect to Mr. Hampden, whose true Character I shall transcribe from other Authors, to prove that the Close of the Character in the History of the *Rebellion* is shamelessly False? And afterwards, let the Author, be who he will, have the Glory of it; or, if we are never to know who he is, let his Champions divide it amongst them.

Whitlock writes of Mr. Hampden. *His Fortune was large; his natural Abilities great, and his Affection to Publick Liberty exposed him to many Troubles when living, and to much Slander when dead. He was a most active and leading Member; he spoke rationally and subtilly, was well beloved in his Country,*

where

where he had a great Interest; as also in the House of Commons, and died lamented.

Another Author, who knew him well, writes of him; *His Reputation for Honesty was universal; of rare Affability and Temper: He always left the Character of an ingenious conscientious Person: He was indeed a very wise Man, and of great Parts, supreme Governour over all his Passions and Affections, of personal Courage equal to his Parts.* Notwithstanding all which, it is most certain, if you will believe Bishop Atterbury, *That he had a Head to contrive, a Tongue to persuade, and a Hand to execute any MISCHIEF.*

There is nothing like it in all Histories, or Critiques upon Histories, from that of Herodotus to Archdeacon Echard's: From Herodotus, who ended the *Fabulous* in History, to Echard, who began it again, supporting himself by the Authority of the History of the Rebellion.

I must here do justice to the very great Accuracy of the late Bishop, who in his Remarks on the Expression in the Letter, inserted in the Preface to my History, writes, *The Words are much softer in the Original; instead of a Heart to conceive,* we find a Tongue to persuade; and, *instead of the Word Villany, that of Mischief; as the Citation is in another Part of this Extract, truly made.* The unknown Writer of this Letter, while he is charging others with the Crime of falsifying Lord Clarendon's History, should have taken care to stand clear of it himself. The late Bishop might easily have seen that that Letter was written off-hand, as indeed it was, in a publick Place, where were several Persons discoursing at the same Time; and the Gentleman calling to Remembrance what Mr. Edmund Smith told him, put it down in those Terms immediately, without having recourse to the Original to compare it with the Expression there; he left that to be done by me, and I omitted it in a Hurry, the Press then waiting for the Copy. But let us see how this terrible Falsification, which stands in Comparison with that of the Editors of the Lord Clarendon's History, is made out; why truly, instead of a *Head to contrive*, it is said a *Heart to conceive*; and instead of *any Mischief*, it is *any Villany*; and I my self quoted it right, as he owns in the very same Page. What a wicked Design this was then; to impose on Mankind! As if the Sense was not the very same, though the Sound had escaped the Gentleman's Memory; and as if there could be any ill Intention to falsify, when the very Words, as in the Lord Clarendon's History, are own'd by the late Bishop to be cited by me, four or five Lines after. Add to this, that the Gentlemen of Oxford will have a hard Task to prove, for the late Bishop, that a *Head to contrive* is a softer Term than a *Heart to conceive*: A Man may certainly *conceive* a Thing which he will never *contrive*; and as to the Word *Villany*, it will be as hard for them to make out, that *any Mischief* is not *Villany*, in the common Acceptation of the Word, which the Bishop's is; and in that of the Lawyers, it is very harmless and innocent. But the Truth is, they make sad Work of it, when they venture upon Criticism, and probably 'tis their Consciousness of their Infirmary that way, which keeps them quiet under so many Objections to the Genuineness of their History from the Errors, Misrepresentations and Contradictions, in Facts and Characters. This I doubt they will never meddle with. This Charge I take upon myself. It is at large in the *Critical Histories*, and Clarendon and Whitlock compar'd. This I shall be always ready to defend. And as to the discovery of Facts to confirm it, I am only the Reporter, I never do it but when I verily believe my Report is true, and could swear to that Belief as safely as, it was said, the late Dr. Friend swore to his History of the War in Spain; which however had a long Answer to it.

Great Frauds are always Deeds of Darkness, not easily to be penetrated; especially when great Numbers are engaged, in Honour and Interest, to conceal them. And this Consideration should have hindered me from attempting to detect that of the Alterations in the *Clarendine* History, if I had not before been fully convinc'd of them by the Disagreement between that and impartial Histories; such as *Whitlock* and *Rushworth's*; and even the Disagreement between some Parts of that very History with some other Parts, of which, as I have said already, there is a long Enumeration in the Index to *Clarendon* and *Rushworth* compar'd: and till the Parties concerned clear up that, they leave a Blemish on the Historian's Character, which it behoves them in gratitude to wipe off. Let me not be mistaken. This is what I do most insist upon, and shall have little regard to what they have or can say of the Genuineness of their Copy, unless they can and do defend the Truth of it. However, I shall not give up any Intelligence towards the Detection of undue Practices

with it, as fast as I receive it, if it is probable and credible, for certain, and beyond all Objection, it cannot well be at such a distance of Time, and while Party is still prevalent, if no Evidence will be allow'd, but what is *viva voce*, and from Persons that were in the Management.

Those who have nothing else to object to what is here alledg'd, will doubtless fall upon that very easy Objection, That most of it is *Hearsay*, notwithstanding the insuperable Difficulties which lie in our Way to any Discovery at all. But if *Common Fame* was sufficient to ground an Impeachment in Parliament upon, as in the Case of the Great Duke of *Buckingham*, *temp.* Car. I. it is surely sufficient to ground a Suspicion upon, as in the Case of an exceptionable Book; especially when in the Book itself there are so many Passages which justly render it suspected. Personal Evidence, such as would procure a Verdict in *Westminster-Hall*, is, it seems, what the late Bishop *Atterbury* expected of me; tho' neither he, nor any one else, ought in Reason to have expected any better Testimony than the Nature of a Thing, so dark, and so well guarded against Discovery, will bear. Yet I cannot help adding, that if I had the Right of *Subpœna*, in this Case, as in one at *Westminster*, I could bring forth as good Evidence for this as was ever brought for any Case at Law. The Persons who gave the Information being all alive still; were I qualified to oblige their Appearance. The late Bishop says,

Pray what is this Evidence! It consists of an *Hearsay* from a Person superior to all Suspicion, but too illustrious to be named. Here he has very candidly left out, without Leave, and therein alter'd the Sense by maiming the Expression. Such is the Treatment I am like to have from them. The late Bishop knew very well that *Peerage and Privilege* forbid the naming illustrious Persons without their Consent; and he would doubtless have been very glad if I had fallen into the Breach of such Privilege by strengthening my Evidence against him. The *Hearsay* is this: Two or three Months after *The History of the Reigns of the Stuarts* was published, a Letter was shewn me by a Divine, now living, from a Gentleman in the Temple, who in Conversation with that illustrious Person, had from him Expressions like these: Mr. *Oldmixon* does not seem to have hit upon the Reason of the Alterations made in the Lord *Clarendon's* History. I was told by a very great Lady, it was because *there were so many Things said in it reflecting upon those Princes, that it made them appear the worst of Men*, which could not be born with. This I took from the Letter itself, and I could not doubt of the Sincerity of the Writer; yet had not I been mad, to have call'd upon a Person of so great Eminence to bear witness for me? And yet had I not been unjust to myself, if I had sunk it?

The Appeal to the other honourable Person the late Bishop speaks of, stands good as to myself. For that honourable Person saying the Original had been, if it was not still, in his Custody, he must know whether it was or was not alter'd. And to such a one I shall be always ready to appeal.

The Reverend Doctor, now living assur'd me, that his Business to Oxford was on purpose, that, since all must come out, by means of a Barber and a Dutch Compositor, an English one having denied him, he saw the whole Process of the Printing at the Press, and was a Witness of the Alterations in both Copy, Proofs, and Revises, as they were said to be made at *Westminster* and *Christ-Church*. Before I part with this, let me appeal to another Reverend Divine, now or lately a Member of the University of Oxford, whether he did not declare in a publick Coffee-House, in a great Town, one hundred and twenty Miles West of London, about two Years ago, that he was just come from Oxford, where he had talked with several Collegiates, who agreed that Alterations had been made in *Clarendon*, but not so many, nor of such Consequence as in *Oldmixon's History*; which probably may be pretty near the Fact, excepting, as the Lawyers say, in the Cases already by me excepted.

The last Evidence the Bishop calls upon me to produce, is the most substantial one against him. The Gentleman of Distinction, both for Merit and Quality, who, I assert again, has by him a History of the Rebellion, of the first Folio Edition, scored in many Places. I add now some Hundreds, to mark the Forgery, by Mr. *Edmund Smith* of *Christ-Church, Oxon.* Let me add farther, that this same Gentleman did, by *Smith's* Directions, go a great Way in distinguishing the genuine from the altered Passages, which took up near one hundred Sheets of Paper, and are forth-coming. But why should he not be as tenacious of his MS. as the *Christ-Church* Men and their Successors were, and are, of theirs; of which more hereafter?

And

And why should he expose his Name and Character to the Violence and Insolence of Bigots and Party-Men? What I have met with, shews what he, and all who think like him, may expect to meet with, if they list in this Service. But let us have another Issue for our Dispute.

If there is no such scored Book in the World, there is no Truth in the Allegation. If there is, Clarendon's History is forged, or Mr. Edmund Smith is the Forgerer, which comes next under Consideration.

One cannot, if one has any degree of Humanity, read without Pity, what the late Bishop says to depreciate Mr. Smith, who it is well known was reckoned for his Learning and Parts an Ornament of the University. He came to it with so much Glory, that when he was to be chosen from *Westminster-School*, there was, says *Oldisworth* in his Account of him, *no small Contention between Trinity-College, Cambridge, and Christ-Church, Oxon*, which should have him. I make use of *Oldisworth* only because he was of the same Kidney with the Editors of the contested History, and employ'd in a like Service in *St. J—n's Examiner*. He says of Mr. Edmund Smith,

He was endowed by Nature, with all those necessary and excellent Qualifications, which are previous to the Accomplishments of a great Man; his Memory was large and tenacious. A shrewd Circumstance that, towards confirming an Opinion of his Exactness in the Hundreds of Passages scored by him in the Gentleman's Folio Clarendon, as Alterations; as what follows, is of the likelihood of his being employed in them, which he declared himself, a little before his death. He was so good an Historian, that he would talk over the most memorable Facts in Antiquity, the Lives, Actions and Characters of celebrated Men, with amazing Facility and Accuracy: As he had thoroughly read and digested Thuanus's Works, so he was able to copy after him. And his Talent in this Kind was so well known, that he had been singled out by some GREAT MEN to write a History, which it was for their Interest to have done with the utmost Art and Dexterity. Was there another Man so qualified to assist in revising and altering the Clarendine History, and must not a Man, so well acquainted with all Kinds of History, immediately find out the Foibles in that, no very difficult Task? Yet the late Bishop Atterbury affirms, He was certainly not an Author of Rank and Weight enough to blast the Credit of such an excellent History. Here again appears a little deficiency in Judgment. An History cannot be excellent, if it is not true.

Beauty of Imagination, Flowers of Rhetorick, are no Parts of History, which consists primarily in Severity of Truth, Aptness of Reflection, and Simplicity of Style; not one of which Excellencies is, in that excellent History.

If one was authorized to imitate the illustrious Critick upon *Milton's Paradise Lost*, by altering a word only, new and unquestionable Proof of Mr. Smith's being employed about *Clarendon*, as he said he was, might be produced; and instead of being singled out by some GREAT MEN to WRITE, read, to ALTER a History; which we might have some Reason to believe to be the Meaning, was it not for what comes after. *I shall not mention for what Reason this Design was dropt, though they are very much to Mr. Smith's Honour; for though the Design of writing was dropt, the Design of altering was not, as Smith told us himself.*

The late Bishop *Atterbury's* next Insinuation offends Charity as well as Truth; *I forbear saying any thing harsh of one, not able to answer for himself; but many alive, who knew them both, Dr. Aldrich and him, know how improbable, and altogether incredible it is, that Mr. Smith should have had the least Share in Dr. Aldrich's Confidence, on so nice, or indeed, on any Occasion.* There is nothing so true a Sign of the Badness of a Cause, as when People over-do it in the Defence of it. I was, some Years ago, a Witness of a Fellow's being taken up for setting a House on fire; who became suspected purely by his impetuous Zeal to extinguish it; and on the Issue, he was found guilty and hang'd for it. If Dr. *Aldrich* might not think fit to give him a Share of his Confidence, as to altering the *Grand Rebellion*; it is probable and credible, that he might use him on other Occasions, as to make a Song for him, or to take a Glass with him; which they both lov'd, and could not well live in one College so many Years together, without such Confidence at least as that is: especially considering, Mr. Smith was the top *Lyrick*, and one of the pleasantest Companions in *Oxford*. And why should he be so unworthy of the Confidence of the *Dean of Christ-Church*; who was also so well read in Divinity, and so much in the good Graces of the *Regius Professor*, as *Oldisworth* informs us. *I remember him*

him in the Divinity-School responding and disputing with a perspicuous Energy, a ready Exactness, and commanding Force of Argument, when Dr. Jane worthily presided in the Chair: Whose condescending and disinterested Commendation of him, gave him such a Reputation, as silenc'd the envious Malice of his Eneimes, who durst not contradict the Approbation of so profound a Master in Theology. The late Bishop of Rochester has it over again, that what Mr. Smith said of Dr. Smallridge is undoubtedly false: Whereas it is to be noted, that he has not brought one Proof, or Argument that it is so, unless you will take his bare Word, that he had Dr. Smallridge's bare Word for it. And yet speaking of the Gentleman's believing what Smith so solemnly told him, he says, *The Gentleman, who seems to be convinc'd of the Truth of Mr. Smith's Assertions, by his having pointed out and underlin'd the Passages, must surely have been very willing to be convinc'd; otherwise he could not have taken a mere Assertion for a Proof.* I am loth to add, as he does, *in such a Cause, and from such a Person;* as if the one had been meritorious, and the other infamous. Is not this very pleasant in the late Bishop, to cry out against believing *Assertions*, at the same time that, from the *Assertion* of another only, he offers his own *Assertion* for a Proof?

Could the late Bishop hope to impose on Mankind a Belief of his Affirmation, that Mr. Edmund Smith was so far from being intrusted with the Secret of the Management he speaks of, that he did not know *even the Hands thro' which it pass'd*? He did not know what thousands, out of his College, had heard, and believ'd, that the Dean of it was one of those who had the Care of revising the Copy: And because he might not know all those Hands; he argues, let any one judge how rationally and fairly. *He is not to be relied on,* for what he says, of even any one of them, especially Dr. Aldrich; tho' he had himself own'd, that Aldrich was in the Secret with Spratt, &c.

There was not a Student in Oxford, of whom the other Students used to boast more than they did of Mr. Smith. His Excellence in all Parts of polite Learning, was their common Topick, and his Encomium in every Mouth, till this Discovery of his, relating to the Clarendon History, was made publick: and now forgetting his uncommon Merit, and his Attachment to the Party, till a few Weeks before his Death, you see how the late Bishop has treated his Memory, and the Tone is perfectly chang'd in almost all the Colleges. But let us, for the Credit of his Information, see what Oldisworth says farther of him; and then judge of the late Bishop Atterbury's Sincerity and Ingenuity, in what he has said. *He had a Quickness of Apprehension, and Vivacity of Understanding; which easily took in and surmounted the most subtle and knotty Parts of Mathematicks and Metaphysicks. His Wit was prompt and flowing; yet solid and piercing. His Taste was delicate, his Head clear; and his way of expressing his Thoughts perspicuous and engaging. In a word, A generous and noble Emulation grew up with him, and push'd him upon striving to excel in every Art and Science, which could make him a Credit to his College; and that College the Ornament of the most learned and polite University.*

This is the Man, whose Testimony the late Bishop Atterbury rejected, on account of his Inability for the Employment he was set upon, and his Unworthiness to be in the Confidence of Dr. Aldrich: Who was himself, I believe, never stil'd the Credit of Christ-Church, and the Ornament of the University; tho' he was a Man of Letters and Genius, and every way accomplish'd for the Province that was allotted him in the Publishing of the Clarendon History.

After what Oldisworth has given us of Mr. Edmund Smith's Character; how stupid and ridiculous are those *Sophs*, who have nothing to say, in answer to his Discovery, but that he *was not fit to be trusted*; as I have heard, it has been often said, even in that *most learned and polite University*. I should not have used Oldisworth's Authority, on any other Occasion; nor on this, if he did not pretend to have known him thoroughly, and had not been a Writer once highly in Favour with all staunch Churchmen.

I am assur'd, that Mr. Edmund Smith express'd himself to the Gentleman in whose House he died, to have a Detestation for the unwarrantable Practices with the History of the *Grand Rebellion*; and to desire that they might be one day laid open for the Conviction of all Mankind, to prevent any farther Imposition upon them: That Desire of his is not so far from Accomplishment, as the Gentlemen of Oxford may imagine, tho' I am not in the Confidence of those that have the Conduct of it. The late Bishop intimates, that the Design of Smith's Discovery, *was to strike at the Authority of a noble and useful Part of our English History, thro' the Sides of Men of great*

Note

Note and Merit. Now it is obvious, that Mr. *Smith* had not the *Sides* of those great Men in his Thoughts, when he discover'd to his Host what he knew of the unfair Publication of that History; the Discovery was casual, upon the mentioning it in Conversation, without any previous Intention to meddle with it. Mr. *Edmund Smith* had no manner of Temptation to enter on that Subject; it was voluntary, unpremeditated and unlook'd for, and it would be miraculous if he should all at once fall from his good High-Church Sentiment, to those of Liberty and Truth, for the sake of telling a lye, and abusing Persons who were so much respected by his *Party*. The late Bishop having repeated his Eulogy on the History in question, in defiance of the Infirmities and Defects which it is charg'd with, I beg leave to repeat a few Lines after Mr. *Maynwaring*, who was indisputably the best Critick then living: 'tis in *Medley*, N^o 6. *There was once a History so famous among the Grecians, that the greatest Orator they ever had, writ it over eight Times. I wish all our English Orators, that are so fond of the History of the Rebellion, would resolve for their Improvement to write it over as often; and that they may still like it better hereafter, I would advise them no longer to call it a History, which it no ways resembles, but to give it the more agreeable Title of a Pamphlet, at that time much cry'd up by the then Treasurer's Creatures, call'd, Faults on both Sides; the Author of which, notwithstanding the Treasurer H——y was his Patron, quarrel'd with the Earl of Clarendon, mistaking him for his Editors, for calling the Civil War a Rebellion. Mr. Maynwaring adds, How much better would their Pens be employ'd in this Labour, than in writing vile Histories of their own? And who knows but such a thing may be now doing by some Doctor or other, who, tho' not so well able to judge of History as Mr. Maynwaring, may be as fond of that of the Rebellion, as the Grecian Orator was of Herodotus; and why not for the same reasons the Beauty of the Style, and the Agreeableness of the Fable?*

I come now to the late Bishop's reproaching me for want of Manners; which is very surprizing, all things consider'd: *A Foreign Writer*, says he, *has used me in this case with greater Civility than Mr. Oldmixon, whom I know not that I have ever offended; I forgive him his ill Words;* as appears by the Title-Page of his Vindication, *The Scandalous Reflections of Oldmixon*. It is true, the late Bishop never offended me, but as I am one of many Millions whom he grievously offended, by endeavouring to destroy that happy Government, which is the only Security of their Religion and Liberties; and the hard Words that may have dropt from me, in reflecting on the Conduct of the Editors of the Lord Clarendon's History, have no regard to his Person, but to the Office he was said to have taken upon him, of one of those Editors, or rather to the Edition itself. That I spar'd his Person, I could give ample Proofs; and I hope the Indiscretion of those, who pretend to take up his Quarrel, will never provoke me to do otherwise.

There is one Thing the *Foreign Writer* told him, which he seems not to have sufficiently regarded, and that is, the Warning he gave him not to undertake the Defence of Dr. *Aldrich*, Dr. *Smallridge* and himself, on too slight Grounds; for, says he, *il faut que les Eclaircissements soient bien forts pour détruire ces Faits*. What he shall say to clear up this Matter, must be very strong to destroy the Credit of those Facts; and, as I have already observ'd, he has clear'd it only by barely asserting, after a bare Assertion, that Dr. *Smallridge* did not do it, and so the same of himself. Thus, in the Opinion of the *Frenchman*, the Matter lies as it did; and if his own Share in the Work was little or nothing, it does not appear by any better Proof, but Dr. *Smallridge's* was as great as Mr. *Smith* hinted. It must be own'd, that there was some Difference between Dr. *Aldrich* and Mr. *Smith*, before the latter left the College: the late Bishop tells us, the Reasons are too well understood to be explain'd. However, I will venture to explain one of them: The Doctor, his Governour, would have had him to enter and go out on the *Divinity Line*, which he was ever averse to; and what he said upon it, is not a little exemplary. "That the pleasurable Part of his Life, "Mirth and a Bottle, was not consistent with the Character of a Clergyman; and "he would not be a Scandal to it, as too many were." This Difference was so sharpened by Incidents and Tattle, that in the Course of it, Mr. *Smith* wrote an Epigram on the Doctor, but there was no Point in it, that touch'd the Edition of *Clarendon*. *Smith* had been some time from the University, before any other Thoughts enter'd into his head, than what the reading of that History might have inspir'd him with.

The late Bishop of *Rocheſter*, again speaking of myself. *His Attack on me, and on the Dead, who he thought might be insulted with equal Safety, is no Proof of a generous and worthy Mind.* An excellent Lesson this, from a Person in the late

Bishop's Circumstances, which he brought upon himself, by that worthy and generous Principle of his, to sacrifice the Religion and Liberty of his Country to the Pretences of a Popish Impostor, for ought he knew, bred up in a constant Enmity to both! As to insulting him, his Brethren, or their Assistants with Safety, I never thought of the Insolence; and as to the Danger, I was sure there was none, where there was no Breach of Privilege; and I shall be of the same Opinion, let this Contest last as long it will: for I flatter myself, I am appriz'd of the Goodness of their Cause, and the Power of their Criticisms. He concludes with a Prophecy, that the Credit of the Lord *Clarendon's History will gain Strength by Time*; but the same may be said of any Stock in *Exchange-Alley*, by those who are any how interested in the putting it off, tho' it seldom or never rises by such Speeches of it: And I have known Stocks that have been so talked of in the Evening, sink to nothing the next Day at Noon, and never afterwards be heard of in a Market. I do not insinuate that this will be the Fate of Lord *Clarendon's History*, neither do I think that in the main it deserves it; but in particular, for those things which expose it to these Suspicions, Jealousies and Reflections, the World would have no great Loss if it was rid of it.

What I am about to add, is not a Part of History, the Belief of which I would swear to; but having no reason to disbelieve it, I will tell what I have been told.

That the Design of the *Editors* was at first only to correct the Spellings and Pointings, that they were now and then thrown upon a Phrase or two; and the latter growing upon them, it made the Beginnings of the History so discordant with the other Parts of it, that they were oblig'd to go on altering from one End to the other, to make it of a piece: The same Intelligence informs me, that in the original Manuscript, the Historian speaks in the first Person *I*; whereas it is now in the printed Book, *the Chancellor of the Exchequer* always. If the Editors did it to avoid *Egotisms*, so justly censur'd by Lord *Shaftesbury* in his *Characteristicks*, they should have given it another turn; for the *Chancellor* coming upon us eternally, is very surfeiting to weak and delicate Stomachs.

I cannot omit Information that is brought even now while the Pen is on the Paper, without any Desire or Expectation of mine: A Gentleman tells me, that a few Days since he was with a Friend of his, a Man of Veracity, who by his Station in Life, has had many Opportunities of seeing the original Manuscript of the History in question; he ask'd the Gentleman if he had the History of the *Reigns of the Stuarts*: Upon the other's saying he had, he desir'd him to lend it him; for, adds he, I am willing to see what the Author says of the Alterations and Interpolations in the Manuscript, of which I myself have seen many, tho' I never read it through, on account of the bad Hand it is written in, and it being to be had in print. The Gentleman ask'd, if he also might see it; the other reply'd, *yes, one time or other*: and the Gentleman continuing to press him, was answer'd, *I'll let you know in a little while*. Accordingly, not many Days since, he came to him to excuse himself, for that the Manuscript was in the Country, many Miles off, and it is suppos'd will not now be so visible as it has been. Any one may perceive, I could say more if I durst.

This is somewhat more than common Hearsay; but since it would be of extreme ill Consequence to name Names on this Occasion, I must leave it, as I do all other Informations of this kind, to the Reader's Judgment; who surely cannot suppose, that so many different Persons, without Temptation or Sollicitation, would, unknown to each other, agree in contriving to impose on Me and the World, in a Case by which they can make no Advantage, either in Interest or Credit.

I cannot doubt but the Reader will be satisfy'd by what is alledg'd in these few Sheets, that there were Alterations made in Lord *Clarendon's History*; and that the *Editors*, for the Reasons here mention'd, were as likely to make them as any Men living: neither has this Practice of theirs been new with Men of their *Party*, I mean the Enemies to *Moderation* and *Liberty*, spiritual and temporal. We read in *Bayle*, that King *James* the First had *Cambden's History* alter'd, and several Passages were left out, relating to *Mary Queen of Scots*. *Du Moulin*, in an Oration at *Oxford*, said, *The Flatterers of King James had vilely abus'd Cambden's History, striking out many things, contrary to the Opinion of the Author, unde Opus fædè commaculatum fuit*. He adds, *Monsieur de Thou speaking of Buchanan, says, that King James visiting him when he was dying, desir'd him to retract what he had written against his Mother*; that is, to alter the Copy, to leave out or to add: but *Buchanan* answer'd,

My

My Conscience does not charge me with any thing on that account; what I have written, is true. Yet *Cambden*, or somebody for him, says boldly, he did repent of it; to which *Bayle* subjoins, *il y a bien raison de douter, there is great reason to doubt it.*—*What has been may be*, as a noble Lord said, and Thousands before and after him: And from the Principles and Practices of the *Party*, and of the Men in question, there is no room to doubt but that there was the like Practice with the Lord *Clarendon's* History as with *Cambden's*. What renders the Suspicion just and warrantable, is, that the Gentlemen concern'd to vindicate the *History of the Grand Rebellion*, have the Manuscript in their Possession; it is in their Power to strike all Opposition dumb, and it is so much for their Interest and Honour, that there is not a Man of common Sense in *England* but assures himself they would produce the Original, if it was not in the Circumstances we say it is. Till they shew it us in its Virgin Purity, Immaculate and Uncorrupted, all Arguments to prove it genuine will be thought trifling and shuffling——Shew your Book, Gentlemen, it is demanded and expected of you, by all those that have been led into any Doubts of its Genuineness; and believe me, if you *do* not so do, all Mankind will say 'tis because you *dare* not; but are oblig'd to trust your Cause to Assertion and Sophistry; which Cause would be invincible, if what you tell us is true, as it must be, if there is no Appearance to the contrary in the Original. In such case, you will have only to do with those Authors, myself in particular, who insist upon it, that whoever wrote your History, it is False, if compar'd with those Histories which are universally allow'd to be True. If you do not also clear it of that indelible Blemish, 'tis no matter whether it be genuine or not genuine; and all the Encomiums that have been bestow'd upon it within doors and without, in Pulpits and out of Pulpits, signify nothing towards perpetuating it. It will gradually wear into the Character of a *Romance*, as it was lately term'd in an August Assembly; and how long it will exist afterwards, I leave to yourselves to judge.

F I N I S.



